

Appl. No. 09/458,336  
Amdt. Dated 06/30/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 04/27/2004

### Remarks

In response to the Office Action, applicant has canceled the non-elected claims 1-16 and 59-65.

In the Office Action the Examiner had indicated that claims 21 and 38 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claim, which was claim 17. Accordingly, claim 17 has been amended to include the subject matter of prior dependent claim 21, and claim 38 has been amended to incorporate therein all of the limitations of prior claim 17. In addition with respect to claim 40, which was rejected, the Examiner had indicated that the rejection could be overcome by incorporating the subject matter of dependent claim 44 into claim 40; accordingly claim 40 has been thus amended. Claims 21 and 44 have been canceled.

In addition applicant has amended claims 17 and 40 to correct the errors therein noted by the Examiner, claim 35 has been amended to correct the designation of its immediate parent claim and to improve its form, and claim 53 has also been amended to improve its form.

Dependent claims 18 - 20, 22 - 37, and 39 are dependent, either directly or indirectly upon allowable claim 17 and dependent claims 41, 42, and 45 - 58 are dependent, either directly or indirectly on allowable claim 40.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 17 -20, 22- 43, and 45 -58 are respectfully requested.

It is believed that this application is now in condition to be passed to issue, and such action is also respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner believes it would in any way expedite the allowance of this application, he is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard F. Graveman

By   
James W. Falk  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 16,154  
(732) 699-4465